REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated December 21, 2004. Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-12 have been rejected. Claims 1-12 remain pending. For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance, and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Specification

The Examiner has stated:

> **The cross reference related to the application cited in the specification must be update (i.e. update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 1, lines 17-31; page 2, lines 1-7; The entire specification should be so revised).**
> **Appropriate correction is required.**

In response, to address the above-referenced objection, the specification has been amended to include the status, serial numbers, and filing dates of the cross-referenced patent applications, as well as to correct typographical and grammatical errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has stated:

> **Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duxbury et al. (hereafter Duxbury) (U.S. Patent 5604896), in view of Baisley et al. (hereafter Baisley) (U.S. Patent 6292932 B1).**
> **As to claim 1, Duxbury teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of processing an application request on an end user application and an application server including a mapping support language comprising the steps of:**
> **a. Initiating the application request on the end user application in a first language with a first application program [col. 1, lines 32-34];**

b. Transmitting the application request back to the server and converting the application request from the first language of the first end user application to a form for the mapping support language running on the application server [col. 1, lines 35-37];
c. Processing said application request on the application server [col. 3, lines 15-18];
d. Transmitting a response to the application request from the application server to the end user application, and converting the response to the application request from the mapping support language running on the application server to the first language of the first end user application [col. 3, lines 23-27];
e. Wherein the end user application and the application server have at least one connector therebetween [col. 2, line 36], and the steps of (i) converting the application request from the first language of the first end user application as a source language to the language running on the application server as a target language, and (ii) converting a response to the application request from the language running on the application server as a source language to the first language of the first end user application as a target language [col. 8, lines 45-50].

Duxbury does not teach:

a. invoking connector metamodels of respective source language and target mapping support language;
b. populating the connector metamodels with metamodel data of each of the respective source language and target mapping support language, the metamodel data of the target mapping support language including a map, mapset, and a mapfield; and
c. converting the source language to the mapping support language.

However, Baisley teaches:

a. A source metamodel [col. 3, line 39] and a target mapping support language [col. 3, 40-41].
b. the UML model has other information, either as tags or in an external representation [col. 3, lines 48-50] and the metamodel maps data type and attributes in derived data types, maps the derived attributes to aliases of the supertype [col. 4, lines 3-8].
c. converts UML model to a MOF model [col. 3, line 44].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Duxbury and Baisley because Baisley's method of using metamodel for the mapping support would provide a predictable and reliable mapping between the original source language and the target language to Duxbury's system...

Applicants respectfully submit that Duxbury in view of Baisley does not teach or suggest each and every element as claimed, as discussed below.

Duxbury discloses a computer with a terminal emulation interface for multi-environment client/server applications. A computer system includes first and second processing environments interconnected by a gateway. The gateway emulates a terminal in the second environment,

converting service requests from a client in the first environment into dialogues on the emulated terminal by executing scripts in a scripting language. This allows client applications in the first environment to communicate with server applications in the second environment in a way that is completely transparent to the clients. The client is not aware that it is communicating with the server through a dialogue on an emulated terminal; all knowledge of the dialogue is embodied in the scripts. This is of utility in integrating legacy computer systems with new systems. (Abstract).

The Examiner has referred to Baisley as teaching the steps that are not described in Duxbury. Baisley discloses a system and method for converting from one modeling language to another. A method is disclosed for converting a UML model to a MOF model within a repository in a computing system having a repository program being executed by said system and a means for storing data. The method includes the steps of selecting a package within the UML model (or "UML package") to be exported to the MOF model. Next, the UML package and its elements are exported to the MOF model. Next, relations are recursively set between MOF objects of the UML package that correspond to relations between UML objects in the package. Next, MOF reference objects are created for navigable MOF association ends. (Abstract).

Applicants respectfully submit that Duxbury in view of Baisley also does not teach or suggest "converting a response to the application request from the language running on the application server as a source language to the first language of the first end user application as a target language," as recited in independent claims 1, 5, and 8. The Examiner has referred to column 8, lines 45-50, of Duxbury as teaching this feature. However, column 8, lines 45-50 merely states:

> This script is run when the gateway receives a "transfer" request from a client (by way of the TP monitor) requesting transfer of funds from a specified source account to a specified target account. The script converts this request into a dialogue with the remote application 11, so as to perform the desired transfer and to send a response back to the client.

Duxbury also mentions converting a request into a "dialogue" to "perform the desired transfer and to send a response back to the client." However, there is no mention of "converting a response to the application request from the language running on the application server as a source language to the first language of the first end user application as a target language," as recited in independent claims 1, 5, and 8. Baisley fails to cure the deficiencies of Duxbury.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Duxbury does not teach 1) invoking connector metamodels of respective source language and target mapping support language; 2) populating the connector metamodels with metamodel data of each of the respective source language and target mapping support language, the metamodel data of the target mapping support language including a map, mapset, and a mapfield; and 3) converting the source language to the mapping support language.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Baisley fails to teach or suggest the "invoking" and "populating" elements as claimed. Specifically, Baisley fails to teach or suggest, "invoking connector metamodels of respective source language and target mapping support language," as recited in independent claims 1, 5, and 8. The Examiner has referred to column 3, lines 39 and 40-41 of Baisley, as teaching this step. However, Baisley is merely describing modeling languages that are "used to model metamodels." Baisley does not specifically describe invoking metamodels of "respective source language and target mapping support language," as claimed.

Furthermore, Baisley fails to teach or suggest, "populating the connector metamodels with metamodel data of each of the respective source language and target mapping support language, the metamodel data of the target mapping support language including a map, a mapset, and a mapfield," as recited in independent claims 1, 5, and 8. The Examiner has referred to Baisley, column 3, lines 48-50, and column 4, lines 3-8, as teaching this element. However, nowhere does Baisley disclose the elements of "metamodel data of the target mapping support language, including a map, a mapset, and a mapfield" as claimed. Instead, Baisley states:

> 4. For data types with attributes, map to a MOF DataType representing a corresponding structure.
> 5. However, for data types that contain a single attribute, which does not denote significant meaning beyond the data type itself, the attribute may be ignored. In this case, the type of the attribute is used to determine a direct mapping from the UML data type to the a MOF data type, representing an alias of the mapped type.

As shown, Baisley fails to specifically describe the "target mapping support language" that includes "map, a mapset, and a mapfield," as claimed. The data types as disclosed in Baisley are not the same as the "target mapping support language" that includes the "map, a mapset, and a mapfield." The data types of Baisley are specifically associated with the MOF model, which is merely a modeling language used to model metamodels. In contrast, the target mapping support language as claimed is associated with an application request.

Therefore, Duxbury in view of Baisley does not teach or suggest each and every element as recited in amended independent claims 1, 5, and 8, and these claims are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 11

Similar to independent claims 1, 5, and 8, independent claim 11 recites a "target mapping support language" that includes "map, a mapset, and a mapfield." As described above, with respect to independent claims 1, 5, and 8, Duxbury in view of Baisley does not teach or suggest these elements. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claims 1, 5, and 8 apply with equal force to claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 is allowable over Duxbury in view of Baisley for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 5, and 8.

Dependent claims

Dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-10, and 12 depend from independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 11, respectively. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 11 apply with equal force to claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-10, and 12, which are thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 5, 8, and 11.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-12 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

March 21, 2005
Date

Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540